	Response to Comment Letter I27
Comment Letter I27	Man Man Willow
	Ken Von Wiley
	February 7, 2014
SOITEC SOLAR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT	
3800 12-010 (GPA); Tierra Del Sol, 3300 12-010 (MUP), 3600 12-006 (REZ), 3921 77-046-01 (AP); Rugged Solar, 3300 12-007 (MUP); LanWest 3300 12-002 (MUP); ENVIRONMENTAL LOG NO.: 3910 120005 (ER)	
NOTICE OF PREPARATION PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD December 6, 2012 through January 7, 2013	
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING COMMENT SHEET  Tuesday, December 18, 2012 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  EPARTMENT OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES 5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 110	
Planning and SAN DIEGO, CA 92123 Development Services  WRITTEN COMMENT FORM	
Please see contivation on next flage (flage #2)	
fac Comment.	
(Aitsch additional pages as needed)  2-7-747  Signature  Dato	
Print Name  SAIL, FAX or E-MAIL FORMS TO:	
Robert Hingtgen 3977.5 Jewel (valle K. 6) 97  Gounty of San Diego	
Capartment of Planning & Dievelopment Services   Color   Color   Color	
COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 4:00 PM, JANUARY 7, 2013	
100fd AA 02:01 4102/10/5.	

October 2015

7345

Final PEIR

To San	Diego county officials.	
ht. da So exp	The Is Ken Von Wiley and I live at 39225 Jewel Valley Way in Boulevard Ca. 91905 and this letter is ress my opinion on the proposed SOITEC Project. Let it be known that I, Ken Von Wiley ameg of to this project for the following reasons:	127-1
	My property is directly next to one of the proposed SOITEC sights and is directly downwind (east of) said project. My 4 year old son has asthma, and the dust created by not only the construction but also the existence of the site itself (being a totally stripped slock of land without natural vegetation to help contain dust in our very windy area) will have an extreme, and immediate negative affect on my sons medical condition. This proposed project location will force us to leave our home and relocate to an area without the dust issues that will be created by this project.	127-2
2-	Studies have shown that placing an industrial solar project in a residential area reduces property values considerably. My family has spent our life savings on our property and home and lave our small peaceful ranch and hope to live here our entire lives and hope the County that we depend on and pay our tax's too will be here to help us protect our investment.	127-3
	The proposed SOITEC project will literally ruin our beautiful views forever changing the topography and vistas of the Jewel Valley area, subsequently lowering the quality of life we currently enjoy AND paid for when we bought our properties.  Solar plants increase our risk of wild fires in our area. As you know we do get high winds in our	I 127-4
4-	solar plants increase our list of with our drought conditions and poorly funded fire lighting capabilities, puts the chances of loss of life and or property and a much higher chance with the solar plants in place.	127-5
<u>.</u>	Water use. It has been shown at our town meeting held on 2-6-14 that preliminary water usage stats (provided by SOITEC "experts") are grossly underestimated. This fact in of itself is reason enough to reconsider this project and send it back to the drawing board. Boulevard and most areas of the east county are in a desperate water shortage and we do our best to conserve as best we can, so to have a corporation come and take water we depend on for LIFE and usa (steal) it to make a profit, is simply wrong.	127-6
6-	Road traffic and damage to our already deteriorated roads by SOITEC employees and contractors will create more driving hazards to the residents of our area.	127-7
7-	Light pollution. One reason why we invested in Boulevard is because of the beautiful starry right sky's that will be diminished by the addition of more lights to the area.	127-8
£1	Flora and fauna. Huge sloths of land will be stripped to make way for the tracker solar plants forever ruining the plants and animals living there.	Ī127-9
	Lean go on and on with reasons why you should not approve this project but I will close this	ī
	letter with this request I and my family PLEAD with the county to do the right thing and reject this life and property ruining plan brought forth by big corporations only interested in money. Our fate and the fate of our children are in your hands, again, do the right thing.	127-1
	2-7-14	

This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise an environmental issue for which a response is required. The County of San Diego (County) acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the project. The information provided in this comment letter will be provided in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) for review and consideration by the decision makers.

The County acknowledges this comment related to dust concerns. Fugitive dust impacts were analyzed in Section 2.2.3.2 of the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR). Particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) emissions were estimated for the Proposed Project and project design features are required to reduce impacts related to fugitive dust emissions.

The Proposed Project is required to be in compliance with the San Diego Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD's) Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 55: Fugitive Dust that regulates fugitive dust emissions from any commercial construction activity capable of generating fugitive dust emissions beyond the project site (SDAPCD 2009) (see DPEIR Section 2.2.2). In addition, the Proposed Project is subject to County Code Section 87.428. that requires "All clearing and grading shall be carried out with dust control measures adequate to prevent creation of a nuisance to persons or public or private property." Project design features

October 2015 7345

I27-1

**I27-2** 

PDF-AQ-1 is included as a condition of approval to minimize fugitive dust during construction activities and comply with County Code Section 87.428. This condition requires (1) the application of water to suppress fugitive dust during construction activities, (2) the maintenance of dust and debris at public street access points, (3) the stabilization of internal roadways with paving, the treatment of stockpiles, (4) traffic speed limitations, (5) material load limitations, and (6) the application a binding agent to disturbed areas. In response to fugitive dust following completion of construction activities, implementation of dust control measures, including the annual application of a nontoxic soil stabilizer or other acceptable methods, is also a condition of approval and would further reduce fugitive dust emissions during operations.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-PP-5, as described in Section 2.3.6.1 of the DPEIR, requires the development of a project-specific fugitive dust control plan.

This comment raises concerns regarding property values. Property values are not an environmental issue and as such, are not evaluated in the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR). The information in this comment will be included in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

Issues raised in this comment related to potential adverse impacts to scenic views were considered and

addressed in the DPEIR; see Chapter 2.1, Aesthetics. The County acknowledges that the Proposed Project would have certain significant and unavoidable impacts related to scenic vistas and visual character and quality. Also see response to comment I17-5. I27-5 Issues raised in this comment related to potential adverse impacts of wildfire hazards and fire response capabilities were considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Chapter 3.1.4, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.1.7, Public Services. Please refer to the response to comment C3-4. Please refer to common response WR1 and WR2. **I27-6 I27-7** Potential impacts related to traffic and road hazards resulting from the Proposed Project were considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Chapter 3.1.8, Transportation and Traffic. Project design features, such as a traffic control plan and notification of residents would ensure that the Proposed Project would not create local driving hazards (see PDF-TR-1). The County found that the Proposed Project would have less than significant impacts related to traffic. This comment also raises concerns regarding damage to deteriorated roadways; see common response TR1. Impacts to visual resources, including the addition of **I27-8** project lighting to the existing environment and potential effects to dark skies, were discussed in

Chapter 2.1, Aesthetics, of the DPEIR. Please refer to Section 2.1.3.3, Light and Glare. In addition, as provided in Chapter 1.0, Project Description, Location, and Environmental Setting, lighting would be fully shielded and directed downward to minimize effects to surrounding properties. Section 5.1 of the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance: Dark Skies and Glare states that "a fully shielded outdoor light ensures that light rays emitted from the fixture are projected below the horizontal plane passing through the lowest point on the fixture from which the light is emitted" (County of San Diego 2009). As such, use of full shielding on solar farm lighting would ensure that direct uplight is not emitted and that dark skies are protected. Please also refer to the response to comment O1-4.

- Issues raised in this comment related to potential adverse impacts of vegetation clearing were considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Chapter 2.3, Biological Resources. It has been determined that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources with the implementation of mitigation.
- **I27-10** The County of San Diego (County) acknowledges the comment. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.

## References

14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendices A–L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

SDAPCD (San Diego Air Pollution Control District). 2009. Rules and Regulations. Regulation IV. Prohibitions. Rule 55. Fugitive Dust. Adopted June 24, 2009, Effective December 24, 2009.